

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 PATRICK ALLEN,

No. C12-03769 CRB

12 Petitioner,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
DISMISS**

13 v.

14 ERIC ARNOLD,

15 Respondent.

17 Petitioner Patrick Allen shot and killed a man in 2005. He was charged with murder,
18 and with allegations of personal use of a firearm, personal infliction of great bodily injury,
19 and possession of a firearm by a felon. Petitioner pled guilty to the possession charge. At
20 trial, Petitioner did not deny shooting the victim, but argued that he should be convicted of
21 voluntary manslaughter, not murder, because he mistakenly believed that the victim had just
22 sexually assaulted Petitioner's sister. Petitioner's sister had been raped years earlier,
23 allegedly leaving Petitioner both traumatized and highly protective of his sister. A jury
24 found Petitioner guilty of first degree murder and found the firearm use allegation true.
25 Petitioner's motion for a new trial was denied and Petitioner was sentenced to 50 years to life
26 in state prison. Petitioner's appeals were denied in 2011. Petitioner unsuccessfully started
27 seeking collateral relief from the state courts in 2012. In June of 2014, the Supreme Court of
28 California denied Petitioner's final petition for state habeas relief, and this Court granted

1 Petitioner's motion to lift the stay of the habeas proceedings here.

2 In lieu of filing an answer, Respondent Eric Arnold filed a Motion to Dismiss, arguing
3 that claims Three, Four, Six and Eleven in the Petition had not been exhausted. See
4 generally Mot. (dkt. 17). Petitioner responded that he does not oppose dismissal of claims
5 Three, Four, and Eleven. Opp'n (dkt. 23). However, Petitioner maintains that he did exhaust
6 claim Six. The Court agrees.

7 Claim Six of the Petition alleges: "Trial counsel's failure to investigate and present
8 evidence strongly supporting the heat of passion defense denied petitioner the effective
9 assistance of counsel." Pet. (dkt. 1) at H. Petitioner alleges that he and his family told
10 defense counsel about a videotape from a youth development program in 2002 in which
11 Petitioner described his sister's rape as "the worst thing that ever happened to him." Id. at I.
12 He alleges that defense counsel promised the jury in his opening statement that the videotape
13 would support Petitioner's heat of passion defense, but that when someone in defense
14 counsel's office viewed a videotape and did not find the expected footage, defense counsel
15 did not investigate further. Id. He further alleges that after the verdicts, the correct videotape
16 came to light (and was the basis for a new trial motion), and that "defense counsel's failure to
17 adequately investigate and present favorable evidence to the jury denied petitioner the
18 effective assistance of counsel." Id. at J.

19 Petitioner's 2011 Petition for Review before the California Supreme Court alleged:
20 "Defense Counsel's New Trial Motion . . . Affirmatively Establishes that Mr. Allen Received
21 Ineffective Assistance of Counsel, Because the 'Newly Discovered Evidence,' on Which the
22 New Trial Motion Was Based, Would Have Been Produced at Trial By Reasonably Effective
23 Counsel." Mot. Ex. B at 37. It alleged that the new trial motion had characterized the
24 videotape as "newly discovered," but that the trial court found that the videotape "could . . . ,
25 with reasonable diligence, have [been] discovered and produced at trial." Id. It argued that
26 "If the evidence could have been produced with 'reasonable diligence'—as the trial court
27 found—it was counsel's want of diligence which caused their absence at trial." Id. It
28 concluded that "counsel's performance was [therefore] deficient," and cited Strickland v.

1 Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 694 (1984). Id. at 37-38.

2 Respondent's assertion that "a review of the state petition for review shows a lack of
3 factual specificity needed to fairly exhaust the proffered federal claim Six" is simply wrong.
4 See Reply (dkt. 24) at 4. The Petition for Review complained of defense counsel's failure to
5 attain the videotape and show it to the jury during the course of the trial; claim Six complains
6 of precisely the same failure. This is not a case, then, where a petitioner alleges specific
7 instances of ineffective assistance in his federal petition that he did not raise before the state
8 courts. See, e.g., Wood v. Ryan, 693 F.3d 1104, 1120 (9th Cir. 2012) (general allegation of
9 ineffective assistance is not sufficient to alert a state court to separate specific instances);
10 Kelly v. Small, 315 F.3d 1063, 1067-69 (9th Cir. 2002) (specific instances in federal petition
11 not in state petition). To exhaust a factual basis for a claim, a "petitioner must only provide
12 the state court with the operative facts, that is 'all of the facts necessary to give application to
13 the constitutional principle upon which [the petitioner] relies.'" Davis v. Silva, 511 F.3d
14 1005, 1009 (9th Cir. 2008) (citations omitted). Petitioner has done so.¹

15 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Respondent's Motion to Dismiss claim Six.
16 Respondent shall file an answer to the exhausted claims in the Petition within 30 days of the
17 filing of this Order. Petitioner's traverse, if any, shall be filed within 30 days of the filing of
18 the answer.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20
21 Dated: February 9, 2015



22
23 CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGE

24
25
26
27 ¹ Nor is there any question whether the language in the Petition for Review referenced a specific
28 provision of the federal constitution or federal statutes, or cited to federal or state case law analyzing
the federal issue. See Peterson v. Lampert, 319 F.3d 1153, 1158 (9th Cir. 2003). The Petition for
Review cited to Strickland. Mot. Ex. B at 37-38.